

Application Number: 09/915,982

Docket Number: 10002421-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 1-30 remain pending in the present patent application. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended herein. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims.

In item 7 of the Office Action, claims 1-30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,655,130 issued to Dodge *et al.* (hereafter "*Dodge*"). Anticipation under §102 "requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under construction. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 220 U.S.P.Q. 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). In view of amendments to claims 1, 10, and 19 offered herein, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-3 be withdrawn. To begin, claim 1 has been amended to recite as follows:

1. A method for formatting a publication, comprising the steps of:
associating a content item with a publication in a server;
identifying one of a plurality of presentation platforms for a presentation of the publication, each of the presentation platforms presenting the publication to a user in a corresponding one of a plurality of physical forms, wherein the publication may be generated in any one of a plurality of digital formats, each of the digital formats being unique with respect to each other, and each of the digital formats being recognizable by a corresponding one of the presentation platforms, wherein each presentation platform is incapable of properly presenting the publication embodied in an unrecognizable one of the digital formats; and
generating an output file in the server, the output file embodying the publication including the content item in a respective one of the digital formats recognizable by the identified one of the presentation platforms.

As set forth above, claim 1 specifies identifying one of a plurality of presentation platforms for a presentation of the publication, where each of the presentation platform presents the publication to a user in a corresponding one of a plurality of physical forms. Thus, each of the presentation platforms presents the publication using a respective physical form. The physical form may be, for example, display on a number of different types of screens, audio reproduction, printing, or other type of presentation.

In addition, claim 1 further specifies that each of the presentation platforms is incapable of properly presenting the publication embodied in an unrecognizable one of the digital formats. This reflects the fact that some of the presentation platforms might not be capable of rendering or presenting a publication to a user that is embodied in a

Application Number: 09/915,982Docket Number: 10002421-1

digital form intended for another presentation platform. Specifically, if a presentation platform is a personal digital assistant, then the personal digital assistant may require a digital format that it recognizes and that can be displayed on the display screen of the personal digital assistant which is much smaller than the display screen, for example, of a full size computer system. In this respect, the personal digital assistant is capable of properly presenting only those publications formatted in a digital format that is compatible with the presentation capabilities of the personal digital assistant. This addresses the fact that the personal digital assistant may lack the computing power and display capabilities to display all of the attributes of a given publication.

Applicants assert that *Dodge* fails to show or suggest each of the elements of claim 1 as set forth above. In particular, *Dodge* fails to show or suggest the concept of identifying one of a plurality of presentation platforms for a presentation of the publication, where each of the presentation platforms presents the publication to a user in a corresponding one of a plurality of physical forms. In particular *Dodge* discusses the concept of creating a support document that addresses support for software or other components to be executed on one or more different processing platforms such as UNIX, PC, or mainframe. In this respect, content of the support document(s) is stored in a database for each one of these processing platforms. If a user wishes to access a document for support of software operating in a UNIX environment, for example, then the user may specify that a support document be created that discusses a UNIX system and the document is presented to a user. The information relevant to a UNIX system is accessed from the database and the ultimate support document is created therefrom.

In this respect, a document may be generated that includes content for all three different types of processing platforms (UNIX, PC, or mainframe). However, at no time does a user select a presentation platform for the presenting of the documents created, where the presentation platforms present the publication to a user in a corresponding one of a plurality of different physical forms. Rather, the user identifies the platform so that the desired information can be retrieved from the database. The presentation platform upon which the document is presented is not selected by a user.

Also, *Dodge* fails to show or suggest that each presentation platform is incapable of properly presenting the publication embodied in an unrecognizable one of the digital

Application Number: 09/915,982Docket Number: 10002421-1

formats. Rather, the document that is generated from the database information is always presented on a given device that a user has accessed. There is no selection of a presentation platform where presentation platforms present the publication in different physical forms, and there is no discussion of the fact that each presentation platform is incapable of properly presenting the publication embodied in an unrecognizable one of the digital formats. These concerns are simply not present in *Dodge*.


Therefore, Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 10 and 19 be withdrawn to the extent that they incorporate subject matter similar in scope with that of claim 1 above. In addition, Applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-8, 9-18, and 20-30 be withdrawn as depending from claims 1, 10, or 19.

In addition, if the Examiner feels that a discussion with Applicants would help facilitate an expeditious allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned counsel of Applicants.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully requested that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding this Response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Phone: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-0933